





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS





S P E E C H E S

OF THE

MOST NOBLE

THE MARQUIS OF SALISBURY, K.G.

DELIVERED AT EDINBURGH ON THE

23D, 24TH, AND 25TH NOV. 1882

PUBLISHED BY

THE NATIONAL UNION OF CONSERVATIVE AND  
CONSTITUTIONAL ASSOCIATIONS,

ST STEPHEN'S CHAMBERS, BRIDGE ST., WESTMINSTER, S.W.

---

1882.





# S P E E C H

AT

## THE BANQUET GIVEN BY THE SCOTTISH CONSERVATIVE CLUB

IN THE CORN EXCHANGE, EDINBURGH,  
23<sup>D</sup> NOVEMBER 1882.

---

MY LORD DALKEITH, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

I thank you most sincerely for the very kind manner in which my health has been proposed by Lord Dalkeith and received by you. And I feel how much encouragement it is to all who are engaged in the arduous duties which now fall on those who fight in the Conservative ranks, to realise that they are sustained and animated by the support of powerful and influential meetings, such as this. It has been thought, perhaps, something of an intrusion that we should come to this metropolis of Liberalism at all. But we have benevolent views with regard to this metropolis of Liberalism, and we hope soon to clothe it with a fairer name. And it is thought still more an intrusion that we make this unwelcome exhibition of our zeal at a time when the Government imagined that their opponents were a scattered and defeated party, crushed to the earth by wonder at their marvellous achievements in diplomacy and war. Well, perhaps an event that happened in Wiltshire two days ago, may have pointed out to them that the English people do not necessarily hold precisely the same exalted estimate of what has taken place that they do. I think they will find that, however keen we may all be, in unison with the views which we have heard from my gallant friend to-night, to tender the homage of our unrestrained admiration for the valour which has fought in Egypt, and the skill by which that valour has been guided, we cannot undertake to transfer bodily

to her Majesty's Government the whole of the merits acquired by our army. I think before that imputation takes place, this country will require to examine—and examine by the light of those feelings which are produced by the process of paying the bill—the policy by which the war in Egypt was rendered necessary, and later on, to examine the results to which this expenditure of blood and treasure has led.

In speaking of the policy which has led to this war in Egypt, I do not think it necessary to notice the attempts which have been made by some minor organs of the Government to infer that what has happened at the end of 1882 was the necessary result of what was done in 1879. The system of Government, or the system of financial administration, I should rather say, which we counselled the Khedive to set up, was one of which her Majesty's Government, when they acceded to office, expressed their approval of, and which they could have altered or abandoned if they disapproved of it. The system of dual control, say some of the advocates of her Majesty's Government, was one which it was impossible for the Government to manage, and would necessarily overthrow them. You will have often noticed that if a horse and his rider unfortunately part company, it is always afterwards found to be the fault of the horse. But any such imputations are not, to do them justice, authorised by the heads of the Government themselves, and it was perfectly open to the Government to have abandoned the system if they found it fraught with either inconvenience or danger. But it is notorious that they approved of it from the first. I am not myself so far enamoured of it that I should now propose its restoration. But it was an expedient perfectly suited to the circumstances under which it was set up, and it might have been maintained for a very considerable time if there had been applied to it those qualities which are necessary in sustaining any oriental system of administration—namely, that the authority which was vindicated should be vindicated by force so soon as it was vindicated by words, and that no time should elapse between the utterance of a defiance and its justification. That is the condition of the maintenance of authority in every oriental country. If in India you were to deal with a rising against your authority, by telling them in January that you treated them as foes, and waited and took no action till May or June, you would speedily compromise your power of taking any action at all. But this lack of promptitude and vigilance—though, no doubt, it was the lack of those qualities which made the maintenance of the previous arrangements impossible—are not, to my mind, the only contribution which her Majesty's Government have made to the catastrophe which we saw last summer.

You may remember, when the late Government had to deal



with difficulties in Egypt, our immediate course was to appeal to the suzerain Power, and we were able—by earnest appeals, no doubt—to influence the suzerain Power so far, that necessary measures were taken for modifying the conditions of government; and the result of this policy was, that the deposition of the Khedive—being done by the authority of the Caliph—commanded the assent of the Mussulman world. When her Majesty's Government came to office, they came weighted with the unlucky pledges which were delivered in this country. They came, bound to show hostility to the Government of Turkey, and upon the first diplomatic occasion that arose they were forced to fulfil that pledge. The difficulties of Montenegro, the difficulties of Greece, were not matters that interested this country very largely. They could have been settled—it was easy to settle them at any moment, if you chose to do so,—by disregarding the wishes of the Sovereign of Turkey. But we never could venture on that course, because we knew there were other problems and difficulties behind, which, if you made the Sovereign of Turkey your enemy, must lead you into formidable embarrassments. The key of this question of Egypt lay in those previous diplomatic communications with respect to Montenegro and to Greece. At the time it was thought a great triumph that they were settled so easily, and so much to the satisfaction of the certain nations with whom many persons in this country deeply sympathise—that men did not sufficiently see that they were setting against them the only Power that could help them to a pacific solution of any difficulties that might arise in Egypt.

Well, then, look at another peculiarity of this Egyptian campaign. The first thing that strikes you when you look at it as a whole, is wonder that Arabi Pasha with his force, with his opportunities, should have defied as he did the power of such a country as Great Britain. How is that mystery to be solved? If any nation suffers itself to get into war with a weaker nation which is sufficiently civilised to know the great difference that exists between them, you may depend upon it there is something in the conduct of the stronger nation which induces people, induces the weaker nation, to believe it will never exert its strength. We have heard a great deal about *prestige*. I detest the word. It does not really express what we mean. I should rather use the phrase military credit. But military credit stands in precisely the same position as financial credit. The use of it is to represent military power, and to effect the objects of a military power without the necessity of a recourse to arms. You know that a man possessing great financial credit can perform great operations by the mere knowledge of the wealth of which he is master, and that it is not necessary to sell him up to ascertain if he is solvent and can

pay twenty shillings in the pound, in order to have the benefit of all the wealth he can command. It is the same with a military nation that is careful to preserve its military credit. If it does so it may, without shedding one drop of blood or incurring one penny of expenditure, effect all the objects which, without that military credit, can only result in much waste of blood and treasure. Now we were in the position of a financial operator who had ruined his own credit by doubtful and dangerous operations. We had squandered our military credit at Majuba Hill—we had taken up the position of a Power that was willing to submit to any insult that might be placed upon it. We had proclaimed to the world that we were not ready to fight for our military renown, and the tradition of our ancestors was lost in us. It was a false proclamation—a proclamation that the Ministry had no authority from the nation to make—and which the nation at the first opportunity forced them to disavow. But the disavowal has cost blood and treasure which, if they had been more careful of the reputation of this country, need never have been expended. You know, gentlemen, that in times past, three years ago, those who maintained such doctrines and insisted on the necessity of the maintenance of your military credit as one of the most precious inheritances of the nation were denounced as Jingoës. But these Jingoës are justified now. They have her Majesty's Government for converts. They have forced her Majesty's Government to demonstrate in action that which is their principal contention, that if you suffer military credit to be obscured the fault must be wiped out in blood. My Lords, I feel how inadequate I am to deal with a question of this kind in a place such as this. I know it has been occupied by a much greater artist, and I feel that there has been a loss to the world of splendid specimens of political denunciation, because the misdeeds of the Ministry of 1882 were, unfortunately, not subject to the criticism of the orator of 1880. What magnificent lessons, what splendid periods of eloquence we have lost. Just think that if Mr Gladstone—when the spirit of 1880 was upon him, if he could have had to deal with the case of a Ministry professing the deepest respect for the concert of Europe, the deepest anxiety to obey its will, a Ministry which, with those professions upon its lips, assembled a Conference, and kept it for months in vain debate, and under cover of its discussions prepared its armaments, asked for leave to invade a country which the Conference refused to give, and then, when the refusal was given and the armaments were ready, the Conference was calmly shown to the door, and the country which they had asked the leave of Europe to take, they took in despite of Europe's will! If the orator of 1880 had had such a theme to dwell upon, what would he have said of disingenuousness and



subtlety—of the fair name of England soiled, and the necessity above all things, as a safeguard against selfish politics, of scrupulous obedience to the united will of Europe? Or take another case. Supposing that unequalled orator had had before him the case of a Government who sent a large fleet—a vast fleet—into a port where they had no international right to go, and when that fleet was there, had demanded that certain arrangements should be made on land, which they had no international right to demand, and when these demands were not satisfied, had forthwith enforced that by the bombardment of a great commercial port, would you not have heard about political brigandage? What sermons you would have had to listen to with respect to the equality of all nations—the weakest and the strongest—before the law of Europe! What denunciations would you not have heard of those who could, for the sake of British interests, expose such a city to such a catastrophe, and carry fire and sword among a defenceless people! That great artist drew a picture of Sir Frederick Roberts. I cannot help wishing that he had to draw a picture of Sir Beauchamp Seymour. But allow me to say in passing, that if my poor pencil could be employed, it would be drawn in nothing but the most flattering colours. I think, if we can imagine anything so impossible as the orator of 1880 having to describe and comment on the events of 1882, that he would have noticed one of the most remarkable coincidences which the history of this country furnishes. It is a very curious fact that we have only had one member of the Society of Friends—commonly called, and I believe in the statute-book called “Quakers,” so that I may use the word without offence—in the Cabinet. We have only had one Quaker in the Cabinet; and only once in the history of the world—so far, at least, as this hemisphere is concerned, if I am not mistaken—has a great commercial city of the first class been subject to naval bombardment—and it is a very remarkable fact that when the order was given to bombard that commercial city, that Quaker was in that Cabinet. At all events, grave as these events have been, I think they will furnish some good fruit at least for the future. I hope we have taken a new departure in Liberal politics. I trust that for the future any Minister who cares about British interests, and thinks it right to go to war in their defence, will not be subject to denunciation on the part of the Liberal party for doing so. I am quite aware that British interests were treated with scant respect in 1880; I am quite aware that Mr Gladstone denounced as monstrous the idea that we could claim to control a country, simply because it lay on our route to India—but if ever there was a war—I don’t know what to call it; I believe it was not “a war”—but if ever there were sanguinary operations undertaken for the sake of British interests,

undoubtedly these recent operations in Egypt have deserved that character.

Well then, again, I trust that something has been added to our knowledge of the doctrine of national self-defence. You may remember that in the case of the Afghanistan and Zulu wars we were denounced as unworthy of the slightest moral consideration; in fact, very much stronger words were used, because we maintained that it may be necessary, purely for the purposes of self-defence, that the Power which is defending itself should strike the first blow and become technically the aggressor. If a preparation is being made in a foreign country that is by the side of your own, and a preparation which threatens the security of your possessions, you are, we maintain, by the law of national self-defence, justified in using forcible means to bring those preparations to an end. That was the justification of the Zulu war, that was the justification of the war which we undertook in Afghanistan, because the Russian representative was admitted to the Court of Cabul while our own was driven back.

But what was the justification of these operations which ended in the utter destruction of Alexandria? Why, that preparations were being made on the land—on land not belonging to us, but which, if prosecuted, might have compromised the safety of our fleet, which chose to lie in the harbour, but which might have gone out if it pleased. After that precedent it will be quite impossible for any Liberal Government to limit, as they have done in the past, the rights of national self-defence. With respect to the end of the war we have yet to wait. We do not know what the present negotiations may bring forth. We must suspend our judgments until we see what the result will be. I confess that I should be inclined to look on all these circumstances to which I have adverted with a very indulgent eye if the result of the negotiations which are impending should be to extend the strength, the power, and the predominance of the influence of the empire of Great Britain—for I am old-fashioned enough to believe in that empire, and believe in its greatness. I believe that wherever it has been extended it has conferred unnumbered benefits upon those who have been brought within its sway, and that the extension of the empire, so far from being the desire of selfishness or acquisitiveness, as it has been represented to be, or deserving to be compared to acts of plunder in private life, is in reality a desire not only to extend the commerce and to strengthen the power of our Government here at home, but to give to others those blessings of freedom and order which we have always prized and maintained amongst ourselves. Let us, therefore, in all the negotiations which are before us not be ashamed of our empire.

We are now the predominant Power in Egypt; the valour of

our troops has made us so. Let us observe with rigid fidelity every engagement we have taken to the amiable and respectable prince who rules in Egypt; but as regards the other Powers of Europe, let us follow our position to its logical result. We are the predominant Power, why should we cease to be so? Why should we allow diplomacy to fritter away what the valour of our soldiers has won? If the Government acts in that spirit there will be little inclination to scrutinise the steps of the policy by which the result is reached; but if they allow themselves to be made the mere tools of others—if they act the part of mere thieftakers to the Khedive of Egypt, and are satisfied with bringing this unlucky Arabi Pasha to trial—if no greater or more solid benefit than that accrues from the loss of so many valuable lives and the spending of so much treasure, severe indeed will be the judgment of the people of this country on the Government to whom that result is due.

This matter of Egypt is in suspense, and so also is the other great difficulty with which the Government have had to contend. They are proud of what they speak of as the improved condition of Ireland. I wonder whether it does not occur to them that, both with respect to Egypt and Ireland, if there is an improved condition, it is due to the fact that they have repudiated and cast out the doctrine that “force is no remedy,” and that they have listened to the advice which their political opponents have not ceased to tender them. We have maintained that no good could be done in Ireland, no matter what grievances you have to redress, unless the primary duty of the Government was first discharged—of maintaining order and performing justice. Now, they will tell you that the comparative quietude of Ireland is due to their remedial measures. Their remedial measures were introduced with the spring of last year. Ever since their introduction the outrages in Ireland went on in an increasing ratio, until they culminated in the lamented deaths of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr Burke. Then came the other policy; then came a real genuine attempt to re-establish order and to enforce the administration of justice: and no sooner was that passed by Parliament, and executed with even moderate firmness by the Administration of the day, than at once outrages diminished, and the peace of Ireland began to amend. In the face of this chronology, it is ridiculous to tell me that it is what they call the remedial measures of the Government that has produced the improvement of which they speak. I do not at all deny that it was very desirable to introduce remedial measures; but I should not have counselled the trying of remedial measures which have only had the effect of destroying all confidence in the country, and of driving capital from the land. I should not have counselled measures which destroy the confidence



of every landholder in the security of his own property, and introduced causes of dispute between landlord and tenant. If you were to do anything, it should have been in the direction of an effort—no matter of how small a kind, because in such a matter you could not move fast—an effort to have bound to the fortunes of the empire a larger portion of the population by the links of ownership. I should have counselled such an effort. But, unfortunately, the hope of that has been dissipated by two causes. The fund from which it could have been done—the Irish Church Fund—has been sacrificed to an absurd Arrears Bill; and the tenants have been prevented from any effort to become owners by purchase by being offered a far more eligible fate. Nobody who can get his land by bullying will care to take it by buying. They have been taught by the experience of facts that agitation will bring them what they want, and it will be a long time before they will learn the lesson to take a more humble and more honest part. Well, gentlemen, we have before us these two difficulties of Egypt and Ireland, which have not reflected much credit on the Government, who adopted a means of action borrowed very much from the advice of their political opponents, and that necessity will necessarily affect their policy in other matters.

We have heard it said by distinguished authorities that there are Liberals and Liberals. I should prefer to say that the Liberals are not a party—they are an alliance or a confederation—and it is necessary that each member of the alliance should get something in order to bind him to the common standard. Now, hitherto it has been one of the great merits of the present Prime Minister that he has been able, by vague and mysterious language, to insinuate promises which may go as far as your imagination pleases to wander, and which yet, if grammatically tested, bind him to scarcely anything at all. Now we have before us the instance of the unfortunate Quaker. I suppose, if the election of 1880 conveyed any lesson at all, it was to assure the members of the Society of Friends that they were safe for the future from all wars waged for the purpose of securing British interests, or keeping open the route to India—and we see, by the secession of their eminent representative, how deep their disappointment has been. I have no doubt, if you examine the language of Mr Gladstone, you will find nothing in it which absolutely binds him to the construction of the Quakers. But that is the marvellous skill and cleverness of the man. He can

“ Keep the word of promise to the ear,  
And break it to the hope.”

You remember what class of being it was said was capable of that performanance. There are others who have been fed upon

the same food, but have not yet been subjected to the same disenchantment. We don't know what is reserved for them—whether the word of promise is to be kept to the ear or to the hope. For instance, there are those who desire the disestablishment of the Church of Scotland. Read over the speeches of Mr Gladstone, and they will certainly convey to you the idea, that although he undertook—which was not necessary he should undertake—not to disestablish the Church without a Parliamentary majority for the purpose of enabling him to do so, though he undertook expressly not to smuggle the Church of Scotland out of existence, still that his general intention was to accomplish that desirable reform whenever he had an opportunity. I have not a notion which of the two interpretations he intends in practice to give to his words, and I have a shrewd suspicion that he does not know any more than I do. He is perfectly ready to sail north or to sail south, but he cannot tell you which he will do until you tell him which way the wind will blow. Well, then, there is the case of the farmer. He used language which may mean the rankest Communism, or may mean merely such mitigations of the law as few Conservatives would refuse to consider. It is impossible to know on which alternative he will ultimately decide, but I am told that within the last few weeks the Government have shown a strong inclination to get up a small Ireland in the west of Scotland. I am not the least surprised that they should do so. Ireland has been very useful to them, and if they can only multiply a country in which they might first say force was no remedy; and then afterwards, when it was quite evident that nothing would succeed but force, pass coercion measures; such countries would tend to the longevity of an Administration, and would be multiplied by every Minister who regarded the prospects of his own colleagues. I have no doubt that by refusing to the arm of the law and the decree of the Court of Session the necessary force, efforts will be made to get up that sort of question in the west of Scotland, which may bring landlords generally into contempt, and may give the Government an opportunity of making those alternate displays of leniency and vigour which have conferred so many benefits on the empire.

Well, then, the last specimen of this vague and mysterious language is a much more serious matter. It is with respect to the future legislation for Ireland. Whenever there is to be a Parliamentary hitch, whenever the calculations of the whips have become nervously uncertain, Mr Gladstone is always throwing out hints of his devotion to the cause of local government in Ireland, which his advocates in this country have interpreted to mean nothing but county boards, but which the Irish members themselves have always taken as an encouragement to agitate for

the disintegration of the empire. And when the moment of decision comes, when it has to be determined whether it is county boards or the disintegration of the empire which has been promised, I will engage to you that Mr Gladstone's words are so carefully poised and so judiciously vague, that no one shall be able to say that he has been misled. But that is a cruel way to deal with the interests of a great empire. On the firm belief in the Irish that the inhabitants of these islands mean to maintain the link between the two countries unbroken and unimpaired, depends all hope of the restoration of order or the return to prosperity of that unhappy land. On it depends all the chance of retaining that loyal, that stout-hearted population, furnished in a great measure from our country of old to Ireland, and on which the maintenance of any hope of English supremacy over Ireland utterly depends. There is no worse service that Mr Gladstone has performed to the future of the empire over which he rules than the persistency with which he has used language to persuade them that nothing is fixed, nothing is determined; that if they agitate enough anything may be gained; that no question is ever fixed; that finality is perpetually adjourned; and that if they will only press hard enough, the deepest interests of the empire, the laws which concern its very existence, are matters for legitimate discussion.

I confess I do not often envy the United States: but there is one feature in their institutions which appears to me the subject of greatest envy—their magnificent institution of the Supreme Court. There, if Congress passes any measure inconsistent with the constitution of the country, there exists a Court which will negative it at once, and gives a stability to the institutions of that country which, under the system of vague and mysterious promises, here we look for in vain. Now, gentlemen, I have detained you a long time, but I am only trying to impress upon you that you must not suppose that because in this matter of foreign policy the doctrines which we have urged have been to a great extent accepted, that therefore there is no danger to be guarded against in internal matters of legislation. We do not know what the future may bring forth. We have no guide to enable us to interpret Ministerial promises. All that we know is, that hitherto they have been restrained by no scruple with respect to ancient institutions, by no reverence for private right. They have freely abolished what was old. They have rendered nugatory rights which had existed from a hoar antiquity. They have cancelled contracts which were signed only yesterday. They have determined that rights which men had acquired in confidence from the promise of Parliament were of no avail, and were not to be respected. And only the other day they have made this further



innovation upon our constitutional traditions, that for the first time they have limited freedom of speech in the representative House of the council of the nation. With these warnings before you, you would be indeed unwise if you relaxed your efforts or weakened your organisation. And do not imagine, as many are forward to tell you, that those efforts have no hope, and are a vain beating against the inevitable. I cannot admit that, either with respect to the Conservative party generally or the Conservative party in Scotland. Generally we have this consolation, that we know that since Mr Gladstone introduced his Land Bill, we have won several seats, and we have not lost one. And we also know, that in important matters of policy the Government have found it necessary to borrow the principles of the Opposition. With respect to Scotland, I am told—and my noble friend beside me repeated it—that you are fighting an uphill fight. There is no doubt it is the case. It is a fight which will tax all your energies, and claim all the efforts you can give to it, but it is not a fight without hope. Depend upon it, although you have to deal with a people who are singularly tenacious of an adverse prepossession when they have once conceived it, yet you have also to deal with a people probably above every other in Europe shrewd and penetrating in their judgment. You must not believe that they will continue indefinitely to hold opinions in a changed condition of things, because those opinions were formed when matters were very different. They are quite keen enough to see that political names have altered their meanings, that political parties have changed their stand-points. The Liberal party is forced by the very law of its existence—it is its constant boast—to march constantly onwards. They call it progress, but they have not made up their minds to what goal that progress tends. Already they have traversed the field of the older Liberalism. They have passed from the land where they were under the shadow of the older doctrines of political economy and of freedom of contract. Before them lies the wide expanse of Socialism, towards which they are advancing. By an inevitable law they must march onwards. Those who appeal to revolutionary instincts can do many things, but the one thing they cannot do is to halt. They must go on. They have already passed the border in many points. Their legislation in respect of Ireland, for instance, suffers strongly from the Socialist venom. It will take some time, perhaps, before the people of Scotland are persuaded that the party which was their old favourite is so degenerated. Time must elapse—perhaps generations must change; but in the long run I feel confident that the people of Scotland will not accompany them on this dangerous enterprise. Already, from all I hear, there are signs of change. There is that most pregnant sign of all, that the young are Conservative where

the old are Liberal. That is to say, that the men who are bound by their prejudices and antecedents remain Liberal, and the men free to judge become Conservative. You may be sure that process will continue. It may not happen rapidly, it may happen slowly; but it will happen surely. They will turn from the party which is leading them to revolutionary projects incónsistent with the industrial wellbeing of society, and they will turn to that party to whom has fallen the defence of individual liberty; of the rights of property; of the sacredness of religion; and of those institutions by which liberty, property, and religion have hitherto been so marvellously sustained.

---



# S P E E C H

IN ANSWER TO THE ADDRESSES PRESENTED BY

## CONSERVATIVE ASSOCIATIONS IN THE EAST AND SOUTH OF SCOTLAND

24TH NOVEMBER 1882.

---

SIR GRAHAM MONTGOMERY, MY LORDS, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—

I have to express my sincere acknowledgments for the addresses which have just been presented to me, and to Mr Murray for the kind manner in which he has introduced the address from this city;<sup>1</sup> and to you, ladies and gentlemen, for the very kind manner in which you received me when I rose. It is a matter of great satisfaction to me to receive these evidences of Conservative activity and exertion in various parts of this populous and influential country, at a time which appears to me to be singularly important in our political history, and to engage, more perhaps than any time that I can remember, the sympathies and the earnest effort of every Conservative, because we live in a time of rapid transition. It is said that the Ministry of the day are in the flood-tide of their fortune. I am a little sceptical of that confident assertion; but be it true or false, it is a transitory phenomenon, having little effect upon the deep political changes which are going on by the side of it. Parties are changing their character. Political names are altering their signification. New questions are coming to the front, and new calls are being consequently made for Conservative self-devotion and activity. It is a very common thing for Liberal speakers to try to commend their cause to-day, by references to what they are pleased to call the history of the success of their party in the past. That history is a little legendary. They are apt to claim for themselves the advantage of every good thing that has been done by anybody, and to ignore any mistakes or mishaps that may have happened to them

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix.

in their career. I am not going minutely to compare the performances of the two parties in the past. I am well satisfied with the record that we should have to show.

In the matter of those important acts of legislation which affect the wellbeing of the community directly, and the comfort and happiness of every individual, we have no small performances to show. If we had nothing else to quote but the relaxation of the criminal code, and the passing of the Factory Acts—the most beneficent act of legislation of this century—these things were the work of the Tory party, and on them alone I should be content to repose our claims. With respect to the great political changes, both parties are very much on the same level. Up to the moment when a change became, for good or evil, inevitable, both parties retained their preference for the state of things as it then existed. Neither party wished to abandon the system of protection, or to accept the system of household suffrage till just on the eve of the change. It was imposed upon both of them simultaneously, in each case by a power superior to their own. And in each case the political opinions of the parties were adapted to the circumstances of the time. But the character of the parties in the past seems to me, in the present state of our politics in this country, to be a wholly irrelevant consideration. What we have to deal with is not the past but the present. The identity of present parties with the parties in past times is a matter with regard to which some curious controversy might be raised. I never quite understand how the Liberal party, of which not only the men are changed, but all the principles have changed too, can be precisely identical with the Liberal party of the past. On this matter of identity we know that the distinguished statesman who is at the head of her Majesty's Government entertains very curious opinions. He appears entirely to forget that his opinions are not precisely identical with those which he entertained when he was a young man. I remember on one occasion, in a general denunciation of the Tory party, he quoted what was said of the Tory Government of 1834, saying that the Governments of Russia and Austria rejoiced at its advent to power, but every friend of liberty repined. He entirely forgot that he was a member of that Tory Government of 1834; and so, I think, when the Land Bill was introduced last year, he denounced with great vigour the wickedness of Parliament in having conferred, as he expressed it, behind the backs of the Irish tenants, the power of eviction on the landlords. They did this in the year 1860, when Mr Gladstone was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he was consequently the dominant authority with respect to all that passed in the House of Commons. This identity, in the course of his constant transformations, he seems to have forgotten in his own person, and is anxious to proclaim for the

party to which he belongs. I entirely dispute the claim to that identity. The Whigs and Tories in the past have fought with each other, have criticised and condemned each other; and as their criticisms might meet the circumstances of the time, or the popular approval, one or the other succeeded in obtaining the privilege of serving the people of this country.

But there was no more than the maintenance of the particular principles of the Government to which they were attached, and the criticism of the acts of the party to which they were opposed. Solely and greatly under the influence of the present Prime Minister, a change has come over the action of English parties. The Radical party has now come to the front,—a party whose power feeds upon and depends on the existence of discontent. And as their power depends upon the existence of discontent, so they are not only quick to find it out, but eager to encourage and to promote it when it appears. If they find anywhere a crack that is tending to divide two classes in the community, they hasten to drive in the wedge, and to split it into a chasm. Their office, their function, seems to be to exasperate every animosity between class and class, to fan it into a flame, and draw from it that electoral support which is the object of their industry and their action. Of course, I have no doubt they will tell you that their mission is to hear of grievances and to obtain their redress. Yes; but a party whose mission it is to live entirely upon the discovery of grievances, and which, if these grievances do not exist, and are not found, must die of inanition, is very apt to manufacture the element upon which it subsists. So it is with the informer. It is very good that crimes, if they exist, should be informed against, and public justice should act against them, but still the common informer is a common nuisance. I remember some time ago in London there was a man brought up for the crime of arson, and he was discovered to pursue this curious industry. It was the practice of the police to give every man half-a-crown who should be the first to inform them of any fire that might exist. So the practice of this man was first to set fire to a building and then to rush off to the police and earn half-a-crown for informing them of the fire. Now that is precisely the position of the Radical party in this country. It is no doubt their function to detect and redress grievances, but if you will watch them, you will observe that their entire industry is devoted to aggravating and inflaming any animosities or grievances that may exist.

Now, gentlemen, this party is a very different thing from the old Whigs and Tories. It is a party whose action cannot in any State be continued for any length of time without seriously compromising that unity between the various classes of the State on condition of which alone a great empire can be sustained; and



let me say that this peculiar form of political activity which has been developed into the foundation of a party in our time tells more severely against the humbler classes of society than against the richer. Their favourite topics are those subjects that may tend to inflame the poorer and the well-to-do against each other. Even the great man who is at the head of the Ministry is not entirely above this weakness. I remember when the issue of the last election was announced, he very ostentatiously took credit to himself because he was opposed in London where he said wealth was produced, and in Westminster where wealth was expended. Now it is quite right for a statesman to be forward in defence of the poor; and no system of political opinion which is not just as between rich and poor can hope to survive in this country. But it does not follow that a man is doing any service to his country, or that he is in any way serving the interest of the poorer class, by setting rich and poor against each other. Consider what it is which really concerns the industrial members of society, whether they are workmen or whether they are tradesmen. Great political measures touch them little. Even if you could suppose measures of great spoliation which should divide the property of the rich, how little value could it be to each individual workman or shop-keeper in this great country. But what is of all things important to them is that capital should flow, that employment should exist, that wages should maintain a high level, and that the expenditure consequent upon a high level of wages should fertilise the channels of commerce. But capital will not flow unless there is confidence; and every system of political doctrine which tends to create animosities between the various classes of society is directed fully and in front against that confidence which is vital to the existence of industry. In order that capital may flow, in order that enterprise may exist, enterprise must be free, and investment must be secure. There are plenty of people who are willing enough, when they have money, instead of investing it in such remunerative undertakings as will cause the employment of labour and the general growth of the wealth of the community, who are content to spend it in idle luxury; and in precise proportion as the free flow of capital is discouraged that tendency will gain strength. Look what it is in other countries—in Asiatic countries—where Government is notoriously insecure. Why, there you find that there is the greatest possible luxury and the absolute absence of enterprise. Men who possess capital only hasten to enjoy it because they know they cannot trust their Government, and that if they were to try and increase that capital by remunerative and profitable employment, they would run a great chance of losing it. Now, of course, I am only indicating to you the dangerous tendency. We know very well that our social forces in this island

are as yet too strong to allow any such dangerous results to follow to any perceptible degree; but if you wish to see what is the real tendency of such treatment, look at the sister country, look at the state of Ireland. Whenever the Liberals ask you to listen to them on the ground of their past achievements, just consider the case of Ireland. Ireland, as it is, is a Liberal creation. I know that there is a popular belief that Oliver Cromwell and William of Orange were Tories; but it is not true. The Whigs imposed the penal laws—the Whigs imposed those restraints upon the industry of Ireland of which we have heard so much complaint. The Whigs and Liberals during the present century have had the control of almost every measure designed for the improvement or alleviation of the condition of Ireland. It was the Liberals who passed the Encumbered Estates Act, which threw out and expropriated the old families of the land and drew the commercial investor in land—that very man whose misdeeds they now profess to denounce, and whom they have calmly deprived of his property.

Well, now, in Ireland you have had a policy which in my belief was objectionable from two very different points of view, and in very different degrees. The land policy of the present Government is objectionable in the first instance because it interferes seriously with freedom of contract. Don't understand me to say that that of itself is necessarily a fatal objection. I am quite aware that Parliament claims, and must always claim, a right to interfere and dictate the circumstances of contracts if it thinks fit; but though it has done so—sometimes wisely, sometimes foolishly—the tendency of modern science and experience has been to discourage the exercise of that power to the utmost possible extent. That very law to which I have just referred—the Factory Act—was an interference with freedom of contract—a most beneficial and wise interference; but on the other hand, you have such an interference as the Usury Laws, which were abandoned by universal consent, because they had not fulfilled any of the objects for which they were set up. I think it may be said generally—but, of course, there are exceptions—that when questions of life, or limb, or health are at issue, Parliament does wisely to interfere with freedom of contract. But when it is a question of money,—when it is a question of what men should commercially gain or lose by a bargain,—Parliament had better let grown men settle with each other their own bargains, and any interference on which it ventures is likely to be injurious to both parties. Of course the chief evil that is the result of interference with freedom of contract is to discourage the industry which these contracts affect. Men will not invest their money, and they will not run risks or give their labour, if their efforts are



thwarted in this direction or in that by the ignorant interference of a power which frequently does not understand the conditions of the industry with which it meddles. And the other evil is that there will be a constant effort to evade the interference of Parliament; or, rather, there will be a constant effort to get out of the conditions to which the law applies.

Now see what Parliament has done for Ireland. It has laid down a land law which settles how and on what conditions people are to take land; settles it for the tenant and settles it for the landlord by a number of minute and, in my judgment, very vexatious regulations. But, of course, it was impossible to carry out that prohibition, that restriction, to the largest class of holdings. The theory was that the Irish peasant was a mild, gentle, exceedingly simple individual, who was perfectly unable to take care of himself, and who required the interference of those gentlemen at Westminster to settle on what terms he was to pursue his industry. Even if that was true—it obviously was not true of the grazier who held land to the value of £150 or £200 a year or more; so Parliament has had to allow those who held on that level—I think the limit is £150 a year—to contract themselves out of that Act. Now, mark the result of this proceeding, because it is an instructive instance of the danger of interfering with freedom of contract. Every landlord knows that if he can get his land into blocks forming farms worth £150 a year, he can get himself out of the vexatious restrictions of the Land Act. Well, of course, there will be many landlords—men attached to their tenantry, attached to their estates—who will not take any advantage of the law, and will be kindly to their tenants, though it be to their own hindrance. But you must not count on sentiment of that kind. The only wise legislation is the legislation that assumes that every man will act according to his own interests; and so in a great many instances—in the instances of weaker and poorer men who are struggling for their lives, and who depend on their estates for the maintenance and education of their families—you will find that they will take advantage of every relief that the law can give them. And if a man of that kind were to go to his man of business and say, “What should I do to get out of the restrictions and privations that this Land Act imposes upon me?” the man of business would reply, “Why, you will watch your tenants carefully, and the moment a man is in arrear with his rent, you will get rid of him. You should evict him without mercy; and then, when you have brought together a sufficient number of holdings to make up farms of £150 or more, you will be free from the operation of this Land Act.

I do not hold up such conduct to you as humane or laudable,

but I point out to you the effect of this Act, judging it upon those principles of human conduct, those principles of self-interest, which the Legislature must take as its guide. The effect of it is to make it the direct and imperious interest of the landlords of Ireland to insist upon those very evictions to which we are told the whole misery of the population is due—and that is the effect of interfering with the natural freedom of contract. But there is much worse than this in the legislation on Irish land. To interfere with freedom of future contracts is well within the jurisdiction of Parliament; but to take a contract that already exists, and say that one side of it shall keep all the advantages and the other shall sacrifice its advantages—that is not within the competence of Parliament to enact. What do you imagine the effect will be? Suppose you bought a cow, and Parliament comes down and says, “You have bought that cow; you shall keep your cow, but only pay one-third or three-fourths of the price.” What do you suppose the effect of that enactment would be upon the man who sold the cow? Very naturally he would never care to trouble himself with selling cows again, and keep himself well out of the way of the spoliating action of Parliament. That is what has happened with respect to the land in Ireland. Parliament invited men to come into Irish land on commercial principles. By the passing of the Encumbered Estates Act, and many subsequent Acts, it avowedly encouraged men to come and invest their savings in the purchase of land, and then when they bought that land it says—the tenant shall keep the land, but you shall only have two-thirds or three-fourths of the rent. The effect of that, for which present expediency may be pleaded in its behalf, must be fatal to the future prosperity of the country. Every man knows that this action of the Government is not the limit to which those under whose influence it is walking would wish it to go. While the Government is taking a third or a quarter, Mr Davitt is going about preaching that it ought to take the whole. Well, under these circumstances, do you think that men are likely to invest their money in the improvement of land—do you think they are likely to carry their capital to a country where such things occur?

I lately saw a letter from Mr Mitchell Henry—a Liberal gentleman, but a very philanthropic one—pointing out the enormous wealth that might be made by the application of money to the improvement of Irish bogs. Mr Bright is very fond of dwelling on the water-power of Lough Corrib, and the wonderful results that would come to Ireland if that water-power could be utilised. Well, we had the other day a letter from a clergyman in the west of Ireland, giving a piteous account of the misery of whole districts; and one of the causes that he assigned was that there

now was no remunerative employment. But these are the natural penalties that fall upon a land that is afflicted by this curse, that a Government, whose first duty it is to protect property, instead of that becomes the spoliator of property in its turn. The agitators may tell you that it is the rich man, the comparatively rich man, who is in question, and that it is he who will suffer the effect of such laws. But economical laws are pitiless in their action. It is not the rich man who will mainly suffer when confidence is destroyed. When confidence is destroyed capital will not flow, enterprise cannot be created, wages must fall, and commerce must stagnate; and when the Government, under the pressure of electoral motives, commits a breach of the rights of property, apparently for the sake of a class whom you are told is poor and suffering, depend upon it that in the long-run the class which lives by industry will be the sufferer, because the Government has departed from the right and honest way.

There is another matter to which I should like to refer, because it is a question which justifies, I think, the activity and the energy of those Associations whose addresses have been kindly presented to me, and which is likely to occupy at a very early time the attention of Scotsmen—I mean the Established Church of this country. Now, remember you are constantly told that the distinction between the Conservative and the Liberal party is that the Liberals are the party of progress, and the Conservatives desire to stand still. Now, in the first instance, I deny that the Conservatives desire to stand still. We know very well that we live in a changing world, but all that we say is—before great changes are made in the fundamental laws and institutions of this country, and the principles which have been handed down for a long time, let us be certain that the change commends itself to the settled will and judgment of the people of this country, and is not adopted in obedience to the wishes of a chance majority. But when the Liberals tell you they are the party of progress, is it impertinent to ask them where they are progressing to? A man may tell you that he is a great walker, and is undertaking a profitable journey; but if you ask him where he is going to, and he was unable to say, you would think he was a very odd sort of undertaker. Where is the point to which this progress is to lead? I suppose there is some fixed point at which everybody, according to this hypothesis, would be a Conservative. I presume the most advanced of our Radical friends have particular things in their minds—though they won't disclose them—which if they had got they would then be Conservative, and desire to stop there. But what we wish to know is the point to which they desire to go. And there is no matter in respect to which this frankness would be more desirable than in regard to this question of the Estab-



lished Church. You know how the question has arisen. Some thirty or forty years ago, owing to a very unfortunate decision on the part of a nobleman—who is not a nobleman to whom Conservatives look back with much affection—the great schism of the Free Church occurred. But in the first instance, and for many years, that division was a matter of purely religious concern, with which politicians were not required to trouble themselves. The Free Church fully recognised that it was the duty of the State to maintain an Established Church. But then came in the agitators—then came in the missionaries of discontent—then came in that party who live by creating division between the various classes of her Majesty's subjects—and they have turned the religious issue into a political one; and now the political conflict in Scotland threatens the subversion of the most ancient institution of Scotland, and one closely bound up with all the vicissitudes and fortunes of the country.

It is not necessary that I should dilate to you upon the advantages of an Established Church. You know that it is at once the great security for the presence of religious ministrations, alike in rich and in poor districts; and at the same time it is a security that the great influence of the Church shall be exercised in a manner that is advantageous, and in harmony with the welfare of the State. I do not for a moment say that the Church cannot exist without the State. I know well that it is otherwise; but a Church divorced from the State runs two risks. There is always the risk that the individual ministers will be tempted, and perhaps forced, to excite the zeal and to secure the support of their particular congregations by the constant administration of unwholesome spiritual stimulants, and there is the other danger that the Church itself will not be subject to that modifying influence of the laity, so favourable to toleration and to breadth, which is the result of the influence which the Establishment confers upon the State. The loss of the connection with the State will be the loss of a great power for good, and the loss of a security that influence would be constantly exercised with wisdom and with moderation. I am more concerned to call your attention to the dangers which these great and venerated institutions may run at this time. You were told again and again at the last election that the issue of disestablishment was not immediately before the country, and that the country would be consulted again before such an issue could be dealt with. But the point that I think was not sufficiently considered by those to whom the Established Church is precious in this country is, that if you place in power the enemies of the Established Church, even though they may not at once proceed to the exercise of that power to its detriment, you place in their power the opportunity of so modifying and

manipulating electoral arrangements, that at a future time the Church will be at their mercy.

I can see that those desiring disestablishment, both in this country and across the Border, are supporting the present Government in spite of many discouragements—in spite of being compelled very often to eat their principles, and to approve of that which they should denounce, because they hope from this Government may proceed some manipulation of the machinery by which Parliaments are elected, which shall enable them in the future to attain their ends. It is against that you have to guard. That is the great danger which requires the constant attention of the Conservatives. To those who consider the state of our institutions at this time, and under the spirit which now dominates the conduct of affairs, it is alarming to see how great their insecurity and instability are. Everything depends on the results, whatever they may be, of the chance humour, or the passing caprice of that one day on which a general election is held. You know what a general election is. You know the kind of questions which affect this or that constituency. You know how one constituency votes this way or that way because a particular harbour has not been made. Another constituency is animated by the temperance movement, a third by the anti-vaccination movement, a fourth by a fondness for some particular local dignitary, and a fifth by the unpopularity of some other local dignitary; and there are a thousand other secondary motives or transient motives, even be they of momentary importance, which go to make up the decision on which the proudest of your institutions may depend. The lasting and far-reaching power which is given to the decision of one particular day—to a decision which often is not prompted by any consideration of the great questions Parliament will have to decide—that is, in my mind, the strongest argument and incentive to careful organisation and the careful arrangement of your electoral forces. You never know when the danger may be upon you. You never know when the moment for exertion shall arrive; but you do know that great institutions, such as your ancient Church of Scotland, are in that hour committed to your keeping; that if you then neglect your trust, evils will follow that you cannot repair. And I know no stronger incentive to that energy and activity of which these Associations whose addresses I have now received bear such distinguished evidence than the consideration that, upon the industry with which they pursue, and the judgment with which they achieve the great objects for which they exist, will depend the averting of dangers that we all of us dread to look upon,—the saving of institutions which generations have regarded with respect, the prevention of results which the latest generation



of their descendants may deeply regret, but which no subsequent efforts shall have the power to reverse.

Gentlemen, I feel that on this side of the Border the exhortation to electoral union and to electoral activity is invested with even more importance than any words that could be uttered in England, because here the danger is more immediate, and therefore greater interests at issue. When you are asked to help, when you are asked to join in the efforts which other Conservatives are making, remember that upon your refusal or upon your cordial acquiescence depends whether or not you will bear a worthy part in defending that institution which all Scotland is bound to honour and revere.

---

# S P E E C H

FOLLOWING ON THE

## PRESENTATION OF THE EARL OF DALKEITH'S PORTRAIT TO THE COUNTESS OF DALKEITH.

25TH NOVEMBER 1882.

---

MR CHAIRMAN, MY LORDS, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—

As an old friend for many years of the noble Duke, and as a member of the Conservative party, I have been permitted to say a few words—and they shall be very few—in support of this motion which has now been submitted to you. In appearing before this audience, it is difficult not to remember that this particular hall has within the last two or three years acquired a historical reputation in reference to enterprises that were undertaken in this county against the influence and family of the Duke of Buccleuch, and in reference to certain very remarkable and striking and influential sentiments which were addressed to audiences here. They were shown to me this morning. If I were to repeat them here, I am afraid you would think they were so incongruous with the present state of affairs, that I was laughing at you. I remember noticing that it was in this hall that the most thrilling, the most pious, denunciations were levelled against those who pointed the terrible implements of modern artillery against uncivilised races. I wonder if, with the distinguished orator who uttered those sentiments, it crossed his mind that within three years he would be directing those who served the Queen to point far more terrible implements of artillery against uncivilised races in another part of Africa? And there was also a sentiment about burning villages which took very much at the time—an appeal to the ladies of this county to think of the fearful sufferings of those who were turned out of their villages, and of the guilt of those whose warlike operations led to the destruction of those villages. I wonder if it occurred to him that it

would be his fate within three years to direct military operations which would have the effect of burning, not villages, but one of the proudest cities of the earth, and to initiate operations of which the effect would be the appalling misery that results from turning on the world the inhabitants—the peaceful inhabitants—of a vast city. I do not, of course, refer to these things for the purpose of insinuating that any moral guilt lies upon the right hon. gentleman. I do not think so; but I think that events have proved to him and to you, and possibly will prove to others in this part of the country, that those pious and noble sentiments were uttered a little recklessly and hastily—that they were not really a just foundation for the measureless denunciations which were delivered at the time against the Government that then ruled in this country, and at those who, like my noble friend and the noble Duke, supported it; and that men will learn not to trust entirely to the effusiveness and the seeming religiousness of political denunciations, but to measure their just application to the facts before them. However, the matter which I wish to press upon your attention is of a more peaceful kind. I desire rather to dwell, not upon the defects of his assailants, but upon the individual merit of the noble Duke himself. As a politician he occupies a remarkable and a very distinguished position. His career, if you will examine it, has a remarkable merit of judgment and moderation and far-sightedness which few of the passing generation of statesmen have imitated. At the great crisis of the Corn Laws in 1845 it was given to him, I think almost alone among the Ministry of Sir Robert Peel, on the one hand, to see that the position of agricultural protection was not tenable, and was one which ought not to be defended; and on the other hand, to see that the difference from his party in that respect was no sort of justification for changing his opinions and allies on all other political matters. And therefore it was that he, I think alone, while joining the Ministry of Sir Robert Peel in that which was a right and necessary act, when that controversy was over, quietly took his rank again by the side of those to whom his former opinions had always united him. Many, too many of his colleagues, and Mr Gladstone at their head, appeared to find in that one difference of opinion a justification for renouncing all that they had ever supported, and supporting all that they had formerly opposed. It is no slight merit in a statesman that he was able to resist the luring example of so many distinguished colleagues, and to draw the line between adhering to doctrines that were obsolete and untenable and the opposite excess to which so many of his friends rushed, of throwing over and changing their political convictions altogether. What he has been in public he has been in private—the same calm, moderate, equable, just, and energetic man. I need not



dwell upon his private virtues to you, for they are well known to you by personal experience; but it is impossible not to see in the influence, which through a long life he has maintained, a testimony to the virtues by which that influence has been deserved. In some other lands it might be said that his rank and his great wealth were of some account in the power he had obtained and the attachment that was tendered towards him; but in modern Scotland, at least, that is not the case. Here, I believe, in this thriving and busy population, where the constant creation of wealth tends to stimulate the sentiment of equality—here, I believe, if a man who has great wealth and rank, at the same time preserves a vast influence and popularity, it is a conspicuous proof of the personal merits by which that popularity has been earned. Through a long life he has devoted himself with unflagging and ungrudging labour to the various and complicated duties which his high position has imposed upon him, and he has obtained as his reward a widespread attachment, which it has been given to few to obtain, and fewer still to deserve.

## A P P E N D I X.

---

“TO THE MOST NOBLE THE MARQUIS OF SALISBURY, K.G.,  
&c. &c. &c.

“WE, the members of the City of Edinburgh Conservative Association, beg to offer your Lordship a hearty welcome to the capital of Scotland. We hail your presence among us as a fresh proof of the cordial relations which subsist between the Conservative party and its leaders. In all the vicissitudes of political fortune you have maintained our principles with unflinching courage and constancy, and you possess in the fullest measure our gratitude and our confidence. Your past services to the nation are matters of history, and no detraction can dim their lustre. We do not forget that you were the associate of Lord Beaconsfield in restoring Great Britain to her rightful place in the councils of Europe, in maintaining her honour not by war but by diplomacy, and in securing fresh guarantees for the peace of the world; and if the full advantage of these great achievements has been imperilled by the rash language and the vacillating conduct of your successors in office, you have witnessed the vindication of your policy, not less in the success which has attended its imitation than in the ignominy which has followed its reversal. In the illustrious House whose best traditions are embodied in your person, and to whose patriotism the country owes so much of its order and its freedom, your influence is deservedly paramount. We feel assured it will always be used on behalf of those ancient and popular principles in which lie the best hopes both of individual liberty and of national strength. Ere long, we trust, it will again be wielded with all the weight that attaches to a Minister of the Queen.

“*In the name and on behalf of the Association,*

“T. GRAHAM MURRAY,  
*Chairman.*”

The Address, which was read amid cheering at the intervals, was also signed by the Chairmen of the Conservative Associations of West Aberdeenshire, East Aberdeenshire, Berwickshire, Old Deer and Longside, Clackmannanshire, Dumfriesshire, Fifeshire, Forfarshire, East Lothian, Kincardineshire, Kinross-shire, Kirkcudbrightshire, Linlith-

gowshire, Mid-Lothian, Mid-Calder and Kirknewton, West Calder, Colinton, Dalkeith, Penicuik, Peeblesshire, Perthshire, Roxburghshire, Hawick District, Jedburgh District, Melrose District, Selkirkshire District, Wigtownshire, City of Aberdeen. Arbroath Burgh, Cupar-Fife Burgh, Dunbar Burgh, Dunfermline Burgh, Eastern District of Edinburgh, Northern of Edinburgh, Southern of Edinburgh, South-Western of Edinburgh, Western of Edinburgh, Forfar District of Burghs, Haddington Burgh, Hawick Branch of the Border Burghs, Jedburgh United, Kirkcaldy, Kirkcudbright Burgh, Leith, Linlithgow Burgh, Maxwelltown, Musselburgh, North Berwick, City of Perth, Portobello, St Andrews Burgh, Selkirk Burgh, Whithorn Burgh, Wigtown Burgh, Edinburgh University, St Andrews University, Peebles Conservative Club, Aberdeen Conservative Club, Dumfries and Maxwelltown Junior Conservative Association, Committee of Management of the Dumfries Conservative Association, Edinburgh Conservative Working Men's Association, Aberdeen Conservative Working Men's Association, &c.











